United Nations A/C.1/57/PV.17

General Assembly
Fifty-seventh session

Official Records

First Committee
17th meeting
Monday, 21 October 2002, 10 a.m.
New York

Chairman: Mr. Kiwanuka ..... (Uganda)

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

Agenda items 57, 58 and 60 to 73 (*continued*)

Action on all draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security agenda items

The Chairman: In accordance with the programme of work and timetable, this morning the First Committee will proceed to the third phase of its work: action on all draft resolutions and draft decisions submitted under agenda items 57, 58 and 60 to 73.

As I informed the Committee at our most recent meeting, we will proceed this morning to take action on draft resolutions that appeared in informal working paper No. 1, namely, cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons", starting with the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/57/L.4/Rev.1, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty".

In this connection, I would like to inform members that the Committee will also take a decision today on draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.28, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East".

After completing action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 1, the Committee will proceed, if time permits, to take action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 2, "Other weapons of mass destruction", starting with the draft resolution in document A/C.1/57/L.5, entitled "Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons".

At this stage, I would like to inform the Committee that at the request of delegations, action on resolutions A/C.1/57/L.23 and L.22 will not be taken this morning.

Before the Committee proceeds to take action on those draft resolutions contained in cluster 1, and as appeared in informal working paper No. 1, I would like once again to review the procedure that was outlined at our most recent meeting on this phase of the work of the Committee.

At the outset of each meeting, delegations will have an opportunity to make a general statement other than an explanation of vote or to introduce revised draft resolutions. Thereafter, delegations will have an opportunity to explain their position or vote on a draft resolution before a decision is taken. After the Committee has taken a decision on a draft resolution, I will call upon those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote on the draft resolution on which action has just been taken. In other words, delegations will have two opportunities to explain their position or vote on a particular draft resolution: before or after a vote is taken on the draft resolution.

In this connection, I would like to draw the attention of the sponsors to the fact that, in accordance with the rules of procedure, sponsors of draft resolutions are not permitted to make statements in

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

02-65149 (E)

explanation of position or vote. I therefore appeal to sponsors of draft resolutions to kindly observe that procedure.

In order to avoid any misunderstanding, I would like to urge those delegations wishing to request a recorded vote on any particular draft resolution to kindly inform the Secretariat of their intention as early as possible before the Committee begins to take action on any individual cluster.

With regard to any deferment of action on any draft resolution, delegations should also inform the Secretariat in advance. Every effort should be made to refrain from resorting to a deferment of action. Please inform us in advance.

I hope that the procedures are clear to all delegations.

I would like now to turn to general statements and the introduction of draft resolutions. Before the Committee proceeds to take a decision on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons", and as appeared in informal working paper No.1, I shall give the floor to those delegations wishing to make general statements other than explanations of vote or to introduce revised draft resolutions.

I call on the representative of Malta to make a general statement on procedure.

Mr. Vassallo (Malta): I would just like to make a point with respect to our procedure this morning. You announced earlier, Mr. Chairman, that two more draft resolutions would be taken up this morning. I would like to inform you that we base our work very much on the informal papers that you provide. In view of the fact that consultations are still under way on several draft resolutions, we do not have instructions on all draft resolutions at any one time. I would therefore like to ask you, where possible, always to give us at least one day's notice before action is taken on any draft resolution. I notice that the two draft resolutions that you have added are to be adopted without a vote, and therefore they will not pose a problem. But I would like to draw your attention to the fact that we need your guidance with respect to what action is going to be taken, and we need it at least one day in advance so that we can seek instructions.

The Chairman: I said that action on draft resolutions A/C.1/57/L.23 and L.22 will not be taken today.

I now give the floor to the representative of Cuba.

Mr. Benítez Versón (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to make a general statement on cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons". As my delegation pointed out during debate in the General Assembly as well as in the First Committee, Cuba's decision to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) was, above all, a reflection of the clear political will of the Cuban Government and of its commitment to an effective disarmament process aimed at ensuring peace throughout the world.

We reiterate that once Cuba's adherence to the NPT becomes effective, which will be as soon as possible, we intend actively to participate in the preparatory process for the next Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty and to work with other States that, like Cuba, wish to bring about the complete elimination of all nuclear weapons under strict international verification.

Several draft resolutions under cluster 1, on which action will be taken today and over the next few days, contain various specific references to the NPT. This year, Cuba will be voting in favour of a number of paragraphs relating to the NPT, on which, traditionally, we have abstained when separate votes have been requested.

Furthermore, our decision to accede to the NPT should not be interpreted as a change in our position regarding the gaps in that Treaty or its discriminatory nature or to mean that our concerns have diminished with regard to the failure of the nuclear Powers to discharge their obligations regarding the NPT. An automatic modification of Cuba's vote with regard to all of the texts that, in part or in whole, refer to the NPT should not therefore be expected. Cuba will be assessing its vote on a case-by-case basis, in keeping with the general balance of each draft resolution.

I should like to take this opportunity, on behalf of my delegation, to convey our sincere gratitude to all those who have shown sympathy for and recognition of Cuba. The majority of Member States did, indeed, express such a position during the general debate in referring to Cuba's decision to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean. We also thank the sponsors of the various draft resolutions in which positive reference is made to Cuba this year.

Mr. Al-Bader (Qatar), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

The Acting Chairman: The First Committee will now proceed to take decisions on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 1, "Nuclear weapons", and as appear in informal working paper 1.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.4/Rev.1, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty".

A recorded vote has been requested.

I now give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.4/Rev.1, under agenda item 73, "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 12th meeting on 15 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents, A/C.1/57/L.4/Rev.1 and A/C.1/57/INF/2.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Colombia, India, Mauritius, Syrian Arab Republic

Draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.4/Rev.1 was adopted by 125 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegations of Angola, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cape Verde, El Salvador, Eritrea, Georgia, Guyana, Honduras, Lesotho, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Paraguay, Saudi Arabia, Solomon Islands and Yemen informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting Chairman: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their position on the resolution just adopted.

Mr. Atieh (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty", contained in document A/C.1/57/L.4/Rev.1, because Syria has repeatedly emphasized that a treaty as important and sensitive as the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), given its future implications and obligations for all Member States, should in no instance ignore the legitimate concerns of non-nuclear-weapon States, which represent most of the countries of the world and which have received no guarantees against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Moreover, these States are prohibited from acquiring various elements of advanced technology that are essential to accelerating the development process.

All fair and informed commentary on the Treaty agrees that its text does not include a commitment by the nuclear-weapon States to eliminate their nuclear arsenals within a reasonable time frame; nor does it explicitly refer to the illegality of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons or stress the need to attain the universality of the Treaty and to end nuclear

proliferation in all its aspects. Such commentary agrees that the text refers to nuclear explosions but not to laboratory experiments or to the qualitative development and production of new nuclear weapons. It also agrees that the Treaty's verification system may allow for the misinterpretation of statements issued by national verification systems and for the arbitrary exploitation of such data for political purposes.

The strangest aspect of the Treaty is that it allows the States parties to act against those countries that have not signed or ratified it, including through significant measures to be adopted by the Security Council in conformity with Chapter VII of the Charter. This would be a violation of the sovereign right of countries to decide whether or not to accede to the Treaty.

The Syrian Arab Republic views such critical omissions with grave concern and categorically refuses the inclusion of Israel in the list of States of the Middle East and South Asia. In view of the tense situation in the Middle East, Israel is the only country that has nuclear weapons and all other forms of weapons of mass destruction, which it is seeking to develop both quantitatively and qualitatively. It refuses to adhere to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and to subject its nuclear facilities to the verification and safeguards regime of the International Atomic Energy Agency. All of this is blocking efforts to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East and is subjecting the region to Israeli nuclear threat, while the international community fails to respond.

Mr. Rivás (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): Despite Colombia's long-standing commitment to disarmament, nuclear control and monitoring and inspection systems, my country found itself obliged to abstain from voting on draft resolution L 4/Rev.1. The Secretariat of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization (CTBT) and the Preparatory Committee are fully familiar with the constitutional difficulties that Colombia has encountered in the ratification of the CTBT. Our arguments have been expressed publicly and transparently over the last two years. Colombia shall continue to seek a satisfactory solution on this issue with the Secretariat of the CTBT in order to fulfil its desire to ratify that major international instrument as early as possible.

Mr. Bar (Israel): Israel signed the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) in September 1996. That decision demonstrated its longstanding policy of supporting the efforts of the international community to prevent proliferation, taking into consideration the specific characteristics of the Middle East and its security situation. Furthermore, Israel played an active role throughout the negotiations on the Treaty in Geneva and contributed conceptually, technically and politically to its drafting. Since the establishment of the Preparatory Committee in November 1996, Israel has played a major part in the endeavour to develop the elements of the CTBT verification regime, including the practical procedures to be adopted in the operational manuals by which the Treaty will be implemented.

Israel decided to vote in favour of draft resolution L.4/Rev.1 because of the importance it attaches to the objectives of the CTBT, notwithstanding its reservations regarding some of the wording in operative paragraph 1.

Israel remains committed to the objectives of the CTBT. However, we lament that only moderate progress has been made to date on several important issues: first, the development and readiness of the verification regime. In our view, its completion constitutes the prerequisite for entry into force, as required by the first paragraph of article 4 of the Treaty. The verification regime should provide for a robust system that is as effective as possible in detecting non-compliance with the basic obligations of the treaty. At the same time, it should be immune to abuse and allow every State signatory to protect its national security interests. Those principles guide Israel in the development of the CTBT verification regime.

In addition, several salient political issues remain unresolved, in particular those related to the geographical region of the Middle East and South Asia. Those problems are further compounded by the lack of acceptance of the CTBT by several States in the Middle East. In addition, we regret the tolerance shown by other States signatories towards attempts that have been made to block or to bypass the functioning of the Middle East and South Asia Group. Such attempts deviate from the letter and spirit of the Treaty, and, if left unattended, may cause serious complications in the future.

Lastly, we are concerned with regard to the negative dynamics evolving in our region, where certain States signatories are not fully cooperative with the efforts to complete and to test the international monitoring system, thus impeding the pace of development of this element of the verification regime.

Mr. Umer (Pakistan): My delegation supported the CTBT draft resolution, contained L.4/Rev.1, because we subscribe to its objectives. It may be recalled that in 1996, Pakistan voted in favour of the CTBT in the General Assembly. However, we were obliged by the imperative of self-defence and, in order to restore the strategic balance in South Asia, to demonstrate our nuclear capability. Had the application of restraint and responsibility prevented the nuclearization of our region, the CTBT might have enjoyed a different status today. We are now obliged to await the development of a broad national consensus on the issue to enable us to fulfil our desire to sign the CTBT in due course.

With respect to operative paragraph 3, it should be remembered that Pakistan was not the first to test a nuclear device. It will not be the first to resume testing. Immediately after the events of May 1998, we declared a unilateral moratorium on further testing. We will maintain that moratorium until the coming into force of the Treaty. Of course, the moratorium will have to be reviewed in the case of an extraordinary development in our region. Also, Pakistan will not be the country that will stand in the way of the entry into force of the CTBT.

Mr. McGinnis (United States): The United States delegation today voted no on the resolution contained in document L.4/Rev.1 because the United States does not support the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT). As delegations are aware, in October 1999 the United States Senate voted not to give its advice and consent to ratification of this agreement.

While the administration has no plans to seek reconsideration of the Senate's action, let me make clear that the United States intends to maintain its moratorium on nuclear testing in effect since 1992. Further, we urge all States to maintain existing moratoria on nuclear testing. The United States takes seriously its obligations under the arms control agreements to which we are a party. In that vein, I want to reiterate and emphasize the strong support of the United States for the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). As a nuclear-weapon State, the United States understands its special responsibility under Article VI of the NPT.

Mr. Issa (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation would like to explain its vote after action was taken on the draft resolution contained in A/C.1/57/L.4/Rev.1 regarding the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. Our delegation did not participate in the voting, because we were outside the Conference Room.

Egypt participated in the preparation of and has contributed to the CTBT, and we reiterate our commitment for the entry into force of said Treaty within the national constitutional articles of our country.

Mr. Goussous (Jordan): With regard to the explanation of our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.4/Rev.1, we voted in favour of it because of the importance we attach to it and to its objectives.

As far as the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) is concerned, we are encouraged by the fact that 166 States have signed the Treaty, 93 have ratified it and 31 have deposited instruments of ratification. We join other member States in calling on all countries that have not yet done so to sign and ratify the Treaty, particularly those 44 States whose ratification is needed for the Treaty to enter into force.

The Acting Chairman: The Committee will now take a decision on draft decision A/C.1/57/L.19, entitled "United Nations conference to identify ways of eliminating nuclear dangers in the context of nuclear disarmament".

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take a decision on draft decision A/C.1/57/L.19, "United Nations conference to identify ways of eliminating nuclear dangers in the context of nuclear disarmament", which was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the Committee's 12th meeting, on 15 October 2002.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

France, Germany, Israel, Monaco, Poland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Yugoslavia

Draft decision A/C.1/57/L.19 was adopted by 111 votes to 7, with 37 abstentions.

The Acting Chairman: I shall now call on those delegations that wish to explain their vote or position on the draft decision just adopted.

Mr. Heinsberg (Germany): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft decision A/C.1/57/L.19, which we have just taken. Like Mexico, which introduced that draft decision, Germany sympathizes with the sense of urgency and the disappointment at the slow pace of progress that underlie the proposal to convene the United Nations conference.

We reaffirm our determination to contribute to the implementation of Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). The NPT is the cornerstone of the nuclear non-proliferation regime and an essential foundation for the pursuit of nuclear disarmament. We particularly stress the need for the full implementation of the 13 practical steps as systematic and progressive efforts to implement Article VI, as agreed at the 2000 NPT Review Conference. The implementation of those 13 steps requires focused effort. Nothing should detract from the obligations undertaken by the parties to the NPT. Thus, we consider the pursuit of those efforts, within the context of the NPT process leading up to the next Review Conference, in 2005, to be of key importance.

Likewise, we deem it of the utmost urgency to overcome the deadlock in the work of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. Linkages that have led to the deadlock should be abandoned with a view to starting negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty as rapidly as possible.

In light of those priorities, and in order not to undermine the NPT process or the Conference on Disarmament, the sole multilateral negotiating forum, we do not consider it appropriate at this juncture to convene a United Nations conference to identify ways of eliminating nuclear dangers in the context of nuclear disarmament. Therefore, we are not in a position to support the decision.

Mr. De La Fortelle (France) (*spoke in French*): I am taking the floor today for an explanation of the vote against draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.19. It is also my honour to speak on behalf of the United Kingdom and the United States.

Like Mexico and numerous other countries, the United Kingdom, the United States and France consider that the process of the Non-Proliferation

Treaty is the cornerstone of nuclear non-proliferation and the basis for nuclear disarmament. We are convinced that establishment of a parallel process would be in conflict with this approach. For that reason, we do not think that the conference initially proposed in document A/C.1/57/L.19 would contribute to the process of nuclear disarmament.

Finally, it is unlikely that discussions during the fifty-eighth session of the General Assembly next year would prompt us to change our position. For that reason, we have voted against the draft resolution.

The Acting Chairman: Now the committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.28. I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.28, submitted under agenda item 63, entitled "Establishment of a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in the region of the Middle East". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the 14th meeting of the Committee, on 17 October.

The Acting Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adapted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.28 was adopted.

The Acting Chairman: The representative of Israel wishes to speak. I give him the floor.

Mr. Bar (Israel): Since draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.28, entitled "The establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East", has been adopted without a vote, I wish to give an explanation of Israel's position, with your permission.

Israel joined the consensus of resolution A/C.1/57/L.28, "The establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East", as it has done for the last 20 years, notwithstanding substantive and important reservations regarding certain elements in that resolution.

The policy of Israel has been that the nuclear issue, as well as all other regional security issues, whether conventional or non-conventional, should be dealt with in the full context of the peace process. Israel supports the eventual establishment of a mutually verifiable nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East that should also be free from chemical and biological weapons and ballistic missiles.

Israel believes that the political realities in the Middle East mandate a practical step-by-step approach. Such an approach should begin with modest confidence-building measures, followed by the establishment of peaceful relations in which reconciliation, possibly complimented by conventional and non-conventional arms control measures, could be achieved. This process could eventually lead to more ambitious goals, such as establishing a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction.

As the international community has recognized, the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone should be based on arrangements freely arrived at by all States of the region concerned. Israel believes that such a zone can only be established through direct negotiations between the States of the region after they recognize each other and have established full peaceful and diplomatic relations. It can only be established by the parties themselves, not in a situation where some of the States maintain that they are in a state of war with each other, refusing the principle of maintaining relations with Israel or even recognizing its right to exist.

In this context, it should be recalled that in the Middle East, unlike other regions in the world where nuclear-weapon-free zones have been established, there are continuing threats by elements in the region and beyond against the very existence of one State in the region — Israel. This has a critical impact on the region's ability to establish such a zone.

In view of the present reality, our efforts in the context of this resolution should be focused on the creation of a stable environment of peace and reconciliation in the Middle East. Israel will continue to dedicate all its efforts to achieve this goal; we call upon our neighbours to do the same.

The Acting Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.34, entitled "Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in the Southern Hemisphere and adjacent areas".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A separate vote will be held on the last three words of the operative paragraph 3, which reads "and

South Asia". After this vote, the Committee will take action on operative paragraph 3 as a whole. After a decision has been take on operative paragraph 3, action will be taken on the resolution as a whole.

I give the floor to the secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (The Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.34, submitted under agenda item 66, "General and complete disarmament", and entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Southern Hemisphere and adjacent areas".

First the Committee will take action on the three words of operative paragraph 3 which read: "and South Asia".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia

Against:

India, Pakistan

Abstaining:

Cuba, France, Israel, Mauritius, Myanmar, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The last three words of operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.34 were retained by 141 votes to 2, with 8 abstentions.

The Acting Chairman: The Committee will now take a decision on operative paragraph 3 as a whole of draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.34.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): Operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.34 reads as follows:

"*Welcomes* the steps taken to conclude further nuclear-weapon-free zone treaties on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned and calls upon all States to consider all relevant proposals, including those reflected in its resolutions on the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in the Middle East and South Asia."

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland,

Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia

Against:

India

Abstaining:

France, Israel, Mauritius, Myanmar, Pakistan, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Operative paragraph 3 as a whole of draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.34 was retained by 145 votes to 1, with 8 abstentions.

The Acting Chairman: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.34 as a whole.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting on the resolution as a whole.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/57L.34 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia

Against:

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

India, Israel, Russian Federation, Spain

Draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.34 as a whole was adopted by 148 votes to 3, with 4 abstentions.

The Acting Chairman: I now call upon those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote after the decision.

Mr. Miranda (Spain) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution L.34, entitled "Nuclear weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas". My delegation fully supports the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in accordance with arrangements concluded among the States in the region concerned. This is why we believe that the draft resolution that has just been adopted is important in order to consolidate those zones and strengthen cooperation within those zones.

In the past, Spain supported the content of the draft resolution by voting in favour of Assembly resolutions 53/77 Q and 54/54 L. Today, however, as we did at the fifty-sixth session of the Assembly and in order to maintain operative paragraph 6 despite our reservations regarding that paragraph, my delegation once again abstained during the vote on the text of L.34.

Assembly resolutions 53/77 Q, 54/54 L, 55/31 I, 56/24 G and the draft resolution that has just been adopted contain in their preambles a reference to the possibility of, inter alia, holding joint meetings of States parties and signatories to the treaties establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones with the objective of encouraging cooperation among such zones. My delegation has nothing against this idea. The text on which we have just voted, however, has a new idea in operative paragraph 6: the holding of a possible new international conference that would be qualitatively different.

In addition, that new conference would imply that we are moving farther away from the consensus recently achieved in the area of nuclear-weapon-free-zones. Indeed, the notion of a potential international conference, as stated in paragraph 6 is an idea which is not mentioned either in the April 1999 report of the Commission on Disarmament on the creation of nuclear-weapon-free-zones in accordance with freely concluded arrangements among States of the regions concerned, nor in the Final Document of 2000 Conference of States parties to review the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in its paragraphs relating to nuclear-weapon-free zones.

Spain has actively participated in these two rounds of negotiations. We are pleased that they resulted in consensuses, albeit difficult ones. We believe that in the two documents we have created a solid basis and that it is sufficient. We do not need new legal or political elements which could justify the holding of an international conference. It is for this reason that my delegation is not in the position to support this proposal and therefore it cannot support the draft resolution.

Mr. Umer (Pakistan): I would like to explain our position on the draft resolution just adopted. Pakistan supports the creation of nuclear-weapon-free-zones freely arrived at among the States of the regions concerned. Therefore we supported the objectives of resolution L.34 and voted in its favour. However, we were somewhat perplexed that the draft once again included in operative paragraph 3 a call for the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free-zone in South Asia.

Pakistan had sought, unsuccessfully, to promote that objective for over two decades. Following the nuclear explosions in May 1998 in our neighbourhood, obliging us to follow suit, the formality of creating a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia became redundant. The reference to South Asia in the text is therefore at complete variance with the realities on the ground. That is why we had voted against the last three words in operative paragraph 3 and abstained on the paragraph as a whole. Our support for the entirety of the resolution reflects our overall sympathy for the creation of such zones in regions where these can be freely agreed among the States concerned.

Mr. Sood (India): My delegation has requested the floor to explain our vote on resolution L.34 and the separate votes on operative paragraph 3 of the resolution and the last three words of operative paragraph 3 of the resolution, entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas".

In our view, that proposal runs counter to the well established principles for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones — that those zones must be established on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region where the zone is desired to be established. The contradiction in operative paragraph 3 is even starker when seen in the context of current realities. A proposal for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia logically has as much validity as proposals for nuclear-weapon-free zones in

East Asia, Western Europe or North America. Given the distortions and contradictions in operative paragraph 3, we have voted against that paragraph. We also voted against the retention of the last three words in the same paragraph and we abstained on the resolution as a whole.

Mr. McGinnis (United States): I have asked for the floor on behalf of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and France, in order to explain our position on draft resolution L.34, entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas". As in previous years, our three delegations have voted "no" on that draft resolution, for it still does not adequately respond to our essential problem and also contains a fundamental ambiguity.

Please allow me to recall the reasons. We remain concerned about the draft resolution's underlying ideal — to prepare the ground for the southern hemisphere to become a nuclear-weapon-free zone. Given that the southern hemisphere's entire landmass, except for a few small islands, is already included within existing nuclear-weapon-free zones, the sole area that remains to be covered is the high seas. Some delegations state that this is not the aim of the draft resolution. They point out that the draft resolution refers to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. But if the new zone will not cover the high seas, what will it add to the zones that already exist? From that reflection, we are forced to conclude that, at least for some, the goal really is to create a new zone that would cover some international waters. Such a step would be contrary to international law and would therefore be unacceptable to all delegations that are committed to respecting the Convention on the Law of the Sea.

I would like to emphasize that our vote on this draft resolution should not in any way be interpreted as calling into question our deep attachment to the Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Pelindaba and the Antarctic Treaties. We, likewise, have no objection in principle to the establishment of new nuclear-weapon-free zones that could make an important contribution to regional, as well as global, security, provided that they are supported by all States of the region concerned and are the subject of appropriate treaties, including general assurances provided by the International Atomic Energy Agency.

The Acting Chairman: We have thus concluded consideration of draft resolution L.34.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolution contained in A/C.1/57/L.40. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.40, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 11th meeting, on 14 October. Sponsors of the draft resolution are contained in document A/C.I/57/L.40, as well as in A/C.I/57/INF/2. The Committee will now proceed to take action.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yugoslavia

Draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.40 was adopted by 98 votes to none, with 54 abstentions.

[Subsequently the delegation of Malawi informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting Chairman: I now call upon those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote after the decision.

Mr. Lew (Republic of Korea): My delegation wishes to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.40, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons". The Republic of Korea believes that all non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), which have renounced the nuclear weapon option, and fully comply with the provisions of the NPT, have a legitimate claim to credible and effective negative security assurances from the nuclear-weapon States.

However, there are still States parties to the NPT which do not fully comply with its provisions. Under the circumstances, we believe that establishing internationally binding arrangements without giving due consideration to the realities is premature.

On the other hand, my delegation does not share the view that nuclear weapons have been pursued due to the absence of such a legally binding international instrument. In our view, what is fundamental to the prevention of nuclear proliferation and the reduction of the nuclear threat is universal adherence to the NPT and full compliance with its obligations.

For this reason, my delegation abstained in the voting.

Mr. Ahipeaud Guebo (Côte d'Ivoire) (*spoke in French*): I should like to request that Côte d'Ivoire be added to the list of sponsors of the draft resolution.

The Acting Chairman (*spoke in French*): The Committee will take note of that request.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.44.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.44, submitted under agenda item 66, "General and complete disarmament" entitled "The Conference on Disarmament decision (CD/1547) of 11 August 1998 to establish under item 1 of its agenda, entitled 'Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament', an ad hoc committee to negotiate on the basis of the report of the Special Coordinator (CD/1299) and the mandate contained therein a non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices".

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Canada at the 11th meeting, on 14 October 2002. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/57/L.44, as well as in document A/C.1/57/INF/2. In addition, the following countries have also become sponsors of the draft resolution: Argentina and Japan.

The Acting Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed their wish that the draft be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.44 was adopted.

The Acting Chairman: I shall now call on the representative of Israel, who wishes to speak in explanation of position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Bar (Israel): Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the efficient and fast way in which you are trying to conduct the proceedings of this Committee. Well done.

Israel joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.44 because we believe that the objective of a fissile material cut-off treaty is subsumed in the Middle East nuclear-weapon-free zone concept.

Israel's approach to this concept was elaborated in our delegation's explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.28, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East". In practical terms, assessing the modalities of this draft resolution cannot be done in isolation from the peace process in all its aspects and the overall effort to reduce tension, curb proliferation and limit armaments in our region.

The Acting Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.51, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the use of Nuclear Weapons".

A recorded vote has been requested.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.51, submitted under agenda item 67, entitled "Review and implementation of the Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session of the General Assembly". The draft resolution, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons" was introduced by the representative of India at the 11th meeting of the Committee on 14 October 2002. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/57/L.51 as well as in document A/C.1/57/INF/2.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yugoslavia

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.51 was adopted by 98 votes to 45, with 9 abstentions.

The Acting Chairman: I shall now give the floor to the representative of China, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Hu Xiaodi (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): China has always believed that the five nuclear-weapon States should undertake never at any time or under any circumstances to be the first to use nuclear weapons and that those five States should also unconditionally commit themselves never to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against any non-nuclear State or nuclear-weapon-free zone. In line with this, the negotiation and conclusion of a convention banning the

use of nuclear weapons would also forcefully advance the realization of a nuclear-weapon-free world.

Therefore, the Chinese delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.51.

The Acting Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.52, entitled "Reducing nuclear danger".

A recorded vote has been requested.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.52, entitled "Reducing nuclear danger", was submitted under agenda item 66, entitled "General and complete disarmament", by the representative of India at the 15th meeting of the Committee, on 17 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are contained in document A/C.1/57/L.52, as well as in document A/C.1/57/INF/2.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yugoslavia

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Brazil, China, Georgia, Israel, Japan, Kazakhstan, Paraguay, Republic of Korea, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.52 was adopted by 96 votes to 45, with 15 abstentions.

The Acting Chairman: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote on the draft resolution just adopted.

As no delegation wishes to speak, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.53, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons*".

A recorded vote has been requested. A separate vote on operative paragraph 1 has also been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.53, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons*", was introduced by the representative of Malaysia at the 12th meeting of the Committee, on 15 October 2002, under agenda item 66, entitled "General and complete disarmament". The sponsors of the draft resolution are contained in document A/C.1/57/L.53, as well as in document A/C.1/57/INF/2. In addition, Cuba and the Islamic Republic of Iran have also become sponsors of the draft resolution.

The Committee will now proceed to a separate vote on operative paragraph 1, which reads as follows:

> "*Underlines once again* the unanimous conclusion of the International Court of Justice that there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control."

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia

Against:

Afghanistan, France, Israel, Russian Federation, United States of America

Abstaining:

Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Republic of Moldova, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.53 was retained by 146 votes to 5, with 5 abstentions.

The Acting Chairman: I now call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.53 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Liechtenstein, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Uganda, Vanuatu, Yugoslavia

Draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.53 as a whole was adopted by 106 votes to 30, with 22 abstentions.

The Acting Chairman: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote on the draft resolution just adopted.

Ms. Inoguchi (Japan): I would like to explain Japan's abstention in the vote on the draft resolution contained in A/C.1/57/L.53, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons*".

First of all, we highly appreciate Malaysia's sincere attitude and firm commitment to nuclear disarmament, which led to its introduction of draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.53.

Japan believes that because of their immense power to cause destruction, and death and injury to human beings, the use of nuclear weapons is clearly contrary to the basic humanitarianism that gives international law its philosophical foundation. Therefore, we would like to stress that nuclear weapons should never be used again. Continuous efforts should be made towards achieving a world free of nuclear weapons.

Indeed, the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice (ICJ), which this draft resolution addresses, demonstrates the complexity of the subject. Japan supports the unanimous opinion of the Judges of the ICJ on the existing obligation under international law to pursue nuclear disarmament and to conclude negotiations on that matter in good faith.

Japan firmly believes that we must take concrete measures to achieve steady, step-by-step progress in nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. We therefore believe that it is premature to call upon all States to immediately fulfil that obligation by commencing multilateral negotiations leading to an early conclusion of a nuclear-weapons convention prohibiting the development, production, testing, deployment, stockpiling, transfer and threat or use of nuclear weapons. We believe that such practical steps should be pursued with intensity before embarking upon the negotiations that draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.53 calls upon all States to commence.

Finally, Japan continues to encourage every effort to advance nuclear disarmament.

Mr. Lint (Belgium) (*spoke in French*): I have the honour to speak on behalf of Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands, as well as Germany, Bulgaria, Spain, Denmark, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Norway, Poland and Portugal, which associate themselves with this explanation of vote on the draft resolution contained in A/C.1/57/L.53, entitled "Follow up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons*".

We support the unanimous conclusion of the International Court of Justice, expressed in its advisory opinion, that there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control. That is why we voted in favour of paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

While sharing the view that the ultimate goal of nuclear disarmament is the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, we cannot support the draft resolution in its entirety. We regret that the draft resolution reflects only one aspect of the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice. The advisory opinion is indivisible and must be considered in its entirety. Furthermore, we are firmly convinced that nuclear disarmament can be achieved only through a gradual process. At the Sixth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the States parties declared themselves in agreement with a series of practical steps

to be taken towards that end; the international community should be focusing on the implementation of those measures.

Mr. Meléndez-Barahona (El Salvador) (*spoke in Spanish*): We have sponsored various draft resolutions in this Committee in recent years, and we would like do so again during this session. I would like to inform the Secretariat that this year we would like to sponsor draft resolutions A/C.1/57/L.34, L.40, L.51 and L.53.

The Acting Chairman: The Committee has taken note of the comments of the representative of El Salvador.

Before adjourning the meeting, I would like to inform members that at its next meeting the Committee will continue to take action on draft resolutions as contained in informal working paper No. 2, which will be distributed soon — after the adjournment of this meeting. Informal working paper No. 2 contains the following draft resolutions, on which action is to be taken: under cluster 2, entitled "Other weapons of mass destruction", draft resolutions A/C.1/57/L.5, L.9, L.22 and L.48; under cluster 3, entitled "Outer space (disarmament aspects)", draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.30; under cluster 4, "Conventional weapons", draft resolutions A/C.1/57/L.25 and L.33; and under cluster 5, "Regional disarmament and security", draft resolutions A/C.1/57/L.39 and L.41.

I give the floor to the representative of Mexico.

Mr. Albin (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to point out first of all that the delegation of Mexico applauds the way in which the Chairman has been conducting the work of the Committee, particularly with regard to the matter of punctuality. That practice must continue.

I am aware that all representatives do their utmost to arrive on time, particularly when the Committee is planning to take decisions on draft resolutions. As representatives, we all have our own commitments in our own offices, where we have to ensure that our papers are in order, and sometimes we run into problems with the elevators.

The Chairman returned to the Chair.

This morning, after the adoption of the draft resolution contained in A/C.1/57/L.4/Rev.1, on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, my delegation was pleased to hear some 20 delegations point out that, had they been in the Room, they would have voted in favour of the draft resolution. In accordance with established practice, those statements will be noted in the records of the meeting. But unfortunately that will not change the voting numbers. In order to avoid another such occurrence, representatives must make an extra effort to arrive on time. I would, however, very respectfully suggest to the Secretariat that when we take action on draft resolutions in the future, we consider first and, perhaps, second, those draft resolutions that we hope and expect will be adopted without a vote, thus ensuring that the greatest possible number of representative are present and able actively to participate in consideration of those draft resolutions that are put to the vote.

The Chairman: The next meeting of the First Committee will be convened on Tuesday, 22 October, promptly at 10 a.m. here in Conference Room 1.

The meeting rose at 12 noon.

United Nations A/C.1/57/PV.18

General Assembly
Fifty-seventh session

Official Records

First Committee
18th meeting
Tuesday, 22 October 2002, 10 a.m.
New York

Chairman: Mr. Kiwanuka ..... (Uganda)

The meeting was called to order at 10.05 a.m.

Agenda items 57, 58, and 60 to 73 (*continued*)

Action on all draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security agenda items

The Chairman: This morning the Committee, in accordance with its programme of work and timetable, will continue with the third phase of its work namely: action on all draft resolutions and decisions submitted under agenda item 57, 58, and 60 to 73. The Committee will continue to take action on draft resolutions that appear in informal working paper No. 2, which was been distributed at the previous meeting.

Before we start, may I ask the Committee's agreement that in order to efficiently proceed with third phase of its work, the Committee first takes action on all consensus draft resolutions contained in each Cluster prior to taking action on the other draft resolution that require a recorded vote. I hear no objection, it is so decided.

In regard to general statements, before the Committee proceeds to take a decision on the draft resolution contained in Cluster II, namely: "Other weapons of mass destruction", I shall give the floor to delegations wishing to make a general statement other than explanation of vote, or to introduce revised draft resolutions.

Does anybody wish to take the floor? I see none. Now we shall proceed on action on draft resolutions.

The Committee will now proceed to take decisions on those draft resolutions that are contained in Cluster II, namely, "Other weapons of mass destruction".

Before doing so, I will call upon those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote on the draft resolutions. There are none.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.5.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.5, submitted under agenda item 58, is entitled "Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Belarus at the 12th meeting on 15 October 2002. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/57/L.5, as well as in A/C.1/57/INF/2. In addition, the following country has also become a cosponsor of the draft resolution: Indonesia.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.5 was adopted.

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

02-65336 (E)

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.9. A recorded vote has been requested.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.9, submitted under agenda item 66 on general and complete disarmament, is entitled "Measures to uphold the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol". It was introduced by the representative of South Africa on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of the Non-Aligned Countries at the 16th meeting, on 18 October.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Israel, United States of America.

Draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.9 was adopted by 140 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegations of El Salvador and Zambia informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: I call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote or position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Lew Kwang-chul (Republic of Korea): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.9, entitled "Measures to uphold the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol". This is a departure from our previous position of abstention. My delegation is pleased to state that the Republic of Korea withdrew its reservations with respect to biological weapons in the Protocol, although, owing to the security situation on the Korean peninsula, my Government maintains its reservations regarding chemical weapons.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/57/L.22.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/57/L.22, submitted under agenda item 72, is entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction". The draft decision was introduced by the representative of Hungary at the 14th meeting, on 17 October.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft decision have expressed the wish that the draft decision be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft decision A/C.1/57/L.22 was adopted.

The Chairman: I call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote or position on the draft decision just adopted.

Mr. Benítez Versón (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): For two consecutive years, and for reasons well known to all, the First Committee has had to adopt procedural

decisions regarding the Biological Weapons Convention, which is so important to us all.

My delegation would have preferred that this time around we might have managed to adopt a substantive decision that would reaffirm the commitment of all States to strengthening the Convention and to the importance of a successful outcome to the Review Conference to begin on 11 November 2002. Adoption of that procedural decision must not be interpreted as a lessening of the basic importance that a vast majority of States attaches to a strengthened Biological Weapons Convention.

Cuba fully intends to contribute to ensuring that the upcoming Review Conference represents a step forward in that process. To that end, it would be a basic prerequisite that all States parties to the Convention display clear political determination to achieve real progress. We hope that that is how it will be.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.48.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.48, submitted under agenda item 66 on general and complete disarmament, is entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Poland at the 15th meeting, on 17 October 2002. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/57/L.48.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee decides to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.48 was adopted.

The Chairman: I give the floor to the representative of Israel, who wishes to make a statement in explanation of position.

Mr. Bar (Israel): Israel signed the Chemical Weapons Convention and participated actively in the Preparatory Commission in order to shape the Convention into a workable mechanism. By signing the Convention, Israel reflected its moral vision and commitment to a world free of chemical weapons.

Unfortunately, while Israel signed the Convention in January 1993, other countries in the region, including those that have used chemical weapons in the past, or are believed to be working to improve their chemical capabilities, have failed to follow suit and have indicated that their position would remain unchanged even if Israel ratified the Convention.

The issue of Israel's ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention is strongly linked to our unique geopolitical environment. As Israel clearly stated at the signing ceremony in 1993, its decision regarding the ratification of the Convention would be subject primarily to regional considerations, including the security climate in the Middle East.

Since the entry into force of the Chemical Weapons Convention, the threat of chemical warfare against Israel's population has not diminished and remains no less valid today. In fact, overall regional security concerns have actually increased.

We wish to reaffirm Israel's view that positive changes in the security climate in the Middle East will be the major consideration for Israel's reading of the issue of ratification.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take decisions on those draft resolutions contained in cluster 3, namely "Outer space (disarmament aspects)".

I call on the representative of the Russian Federation, who wishes to make a statement in explanation of vote on A/C.1/57/L.30, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space".

Mr. Vasiliev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I should like to explain our vote on the various items covered in this cluster.

The conquest of outer space is one of the important achievements in the history of humankind. The possibilities offered by the use of space discoveries and technology for development are truly limitless. Today there are no offensive weapons in outer space, but there are plans in existence to place them in Earth orbit. The potential threat of such a turn of events could become a reality if we fail to muster the political will to prevent the weaponization of outer space and its transformation into a new forum for military rivalry and conflict.

We believe that this matter that should have priority on the disarmament agenda. Regrettably, current norms of international space law do not fully cover the possibility of the weaponization of outer space.

Russia and China, in co-sponsorship with a group of other States, recently spoke at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva and put forward a new initiative on this matter presenting, for general consideration, a joint draft document on potential elements of an international legal agreement on the prevention of the emplacement of weapons in outer space and on the use of force, or the threat of the use of the force, against space objects. This document is to a large extent based on ideas contained in the draft resolution that is being voted on today by the General Assembly. It has been distributed as an official document of the current session of the General Assembly.

At the fifty-sixth session of the Assembly, Russia put forward a proposal that even before an agreement on this issue is achieved, a moratorium should be introduced on the emplacement of military equipment in outer space. Our country is prepared to enter into such an agreement provided that the leading space States accede to that moratorium.

At the beginning of October, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Russia, Mr. Ivanov, stated that our country was prepared to embark on new measures promoting openness and confidence-building with respect to outer space. These would involve the timely submission of information on forthcoming launches of space objects, their purposes and their basic parametres. I should like to take this opportunity to call on all interested countries to join in this confidence-building measure in outer space.

The broad support that exists for the prevention an arms race in outer space has been confirmed by the results of the voting on this draft resolution at recent sessions of the General Assembly. It is our hope that the adoption of the draft resolution at this session of the Assembly will give fresh impetus to substantive discussions on military and space issues at the Conference on Disarmament.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.30.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.30, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the 12th meeting, on 15 October 2002. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/57/L.30, as well as in document A/C.1/57/INF/2.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Israel, United States of America.

Draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.30 was adopted by 151 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The Chairman: I call on the representative of Denmark, who wishes to speak on behalf of the European Union in explanation of vote on the resolution just adopted.

Mr. Nielsen (Denmark): On behalf of the European Union, I am honoured to speak on the draft resolution just adopted in document A/C.1/57/L.30, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space". The countries of Central and Eastern Europe associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated countries Cyprus, Malta and Turkey, as well as the countries of the European Economic Area members of the European Free Trade Association — Iceland and Norway — align themselves with this explanation of vote.

The European Union voted in favour of the draft resolution on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, but in order to avoid any misunderstanding, we deem it necessary to clarify the rationale of our vote.

We want to reiterate that the Conference on Disarmament is the only international multilateral negotiating forum for disarmament. Therefore, it is within the Conference that any decision should be taken regarding work on the prevention of an arms race in outer space. The European Union stands ready to support the establishment of a subsidiary body of the Conference on Disarmament to deal with this matter on the basis of a mandate that will be subject to an agreement by all.

We furthermore wish to recall that the negotiation in the Conference on Disarmament of a non-discriminatory and universal treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices constitutes a priority for the European Union.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take decisions on those draft resolutions that are contained in cluster 4, "Conventional weapons".

I call on the representative of Israel.

Mr. Bar (Israel): This is a general statement on cluster 4 on conventional weapons.

History offers us several important lessons with respect to conventional arms. Armaments in and of themselves do not pose threats to the extent that they are not used for hostile purposes. It is, rather, the poisonous combination of extensive armaments and hostile intentions that poses a genuine strategic threat. Israel therefore believes that the best antidote to the threat of armaments is the creation of an environment of confidence and trust.

States must bear in mind that the need for armaments is a direct response to a given situation. Building trust and confidence in the region will necessarily reduce the need for armaments. When nations live together in a spirit of peace and good-neighbourliness, it will be possible to reduce armaments and to increase transparency.

At the same time, it is important that arms controls and restraints be instituted in a way that will create the proper balance between legitimate security needs and preventing unnecessary human suffering and loss of innocent life. That loss results from irresponsible policies with respect to conventional arms proliferation.

The history of warfare is one in which tremendous civilian casualties have resulted solely from the use of conventional weapons. Conventional weapons in the hands of terrorists or countries that support terrorists can have a clear strategic impact. It is for this reason that my Government views the irresponsible use or transfer of conventional arms as a serious threat to regional and global security and stability. The consequences of the spread of these weapons — or worse, their acquisition by terrorists or criminal elements — invariably results in the loss of innocent life.

Israel believes that the humanitarian dimension of this problem must remain foremost in our minds and serve to guide our deliberations on this matter. Israel believes that the best way to curb illicit arms proliferation throughout the world is through strong national commitment and determination. It is our view that States bear the primary responsibility for ensuring that no weapons are transferred from their territory without proper oversight. States must undertake adequate marking and recording procedures of all weapons, stringent export controls and appropriate domestic legislation to prevent the misuse and proliferation of arms.

One important way to reduce tensions is through confidence-building measures. Their objective is to enhance States' sense of security and to reduce threats and tensions. In considering such steps, however, we must bear in mind the specific nature of conflicts, circumstances and threats in different regions.

In our region, despite the continuing threat and the lack of basic trust between nations, Israel decided to take action for the purpose of building confidence and reducing the humanitarian impact of conventional arms. One step is aimed at increasing transparency in armaments. Although we believe that, in principle, the success of transparency is contingent upon the normalization of political and military relations among regional States, Israel has taken it upon itself to participate in the United Nations Register. Currently, Israel is the only country in the region that regularly reports to the Register and we hope that other countries will join us in participating in this instrument with a view towards its universal application.

Israel also shares the concern of the international community about the humanitarian cost of the irresponsible use and transfer of small arms and light weapons and has taken steps to curb their proliferation. Israel actively participated in the July 2001 United Nations Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects and calls on all States to implement the provisions of the Programme of Action. Israel's national legislation with regard to export controls and marking and record-keeping reflects its commitment to implementing that important document.

Israel attaches particular importance to action aimed at preventing and minimizing human suffering resulting from the indiscriminate use of anti-personnel landmines. Israel believes that an integral component of the effort to address this threat is cooperation. Cooperative initiatives in the areas of mine clearance, mine awareness and victim rehabilitation are of tremendous importance and contribute greatly to efforts aimed at alleviating the humanitarian problem associated with mines.

Israel has taken a number of unilateral steps, as well, including ceasing all production of anti-personnel landmines, declaring a moratorium on the export of all types of anti-personnel mines and ratifying the amended Protocol II annexed to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons. Israel hopes that other nations in the region will join with it in establishing cooperative mechanisms aimed at reducing this threat, preferably within the context of a comprehensive regional peace. It is our view that the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons is a good example of how States can act to restrain the use of arms, while not causing harm to their vital national security interests.

Israel is participating in the current deliberations aimed at finding the proper balance between the legitimate security needs of States and our moral imperative to reduce human suffering. Although Israel shares the humanitarian objectives of the Ottawa Convention, due to regional circumstances and the continuing threat of terrorism, it cannot commit itself to a total ban on the use of anti-personnel landmines. However, we have taken part in several international initiatives aimed at promoting mine awareness and support for the victims of those terrible weapons.

South Lebanon provides an illuminating example of both the challenges and the opportunities Israel is facing with respect to anti-personnel mines. Even following Israel's full compliance with Security Council resolution 425 (1978), the area along the blue line continues to be a source of great danger and instability due to the ongoing crossborder violations by the terrorist organization Hizbullah. At the same time, despite a clear and present security threat, Israel has taken steps in cooperation with the United Nations forces in the area to help protect civilians from the danger of landmines. Israel has provided the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon with all information in its possession regarding the location and types of known landmines, as well as information regarding suspected locations of landmines, and continues to cooperate with the United Nations forces in that regard.

Since the start of deliberations this year here in the First Committee, we have witnessed numerous acts of terrorism against innocent civilians that underscore the humanitarian impact of the irresponsible use and transfer of conventional arms. Only yesterday, Palestinian terrorists blew up a public bus in northern Israel, killing 14 civilians and injuring more than 40 others. We repeat our call upon our neighbours to cease all support for the perpetrators of such crimes, including by supplying them with weapons and explosives. After all, terrorism is only viable if countries allow and even support its fortification through weapons transfers. The loss of innocent life is always painful. Terrorism does not distinguish among

its victims. All of us are threatened by this phenomenon. And all of us have a responsibility to stop it. We therefore hope that the international community will focus its efforts on ensuring the compliance of States with their international obligations. The fundamental commitment of States to resolve disputes peacefully, to cease support for terrorism and to live peacefully within secure boundaries can lay the foundation for a future disarmament of conventional arms.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.25. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.25, submitted under agenda item 66, "General and complete disarmament", entitled "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and collecting them". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Mali at the 16th meeting, on 18 October. Sponsors of the draft resolution are contained in document A/C.1/57/L.25, as well as in document A/C.1/57/INF/2. In addition, the following country has also become a co-sponsor of the draft resolution: Slovenia.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.25 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.25 was adopted.

The Chairman: I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote or position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Assaf (Lebanon) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation has joined the consensus on the draft resolution that we have just adopted out of its conviction of the need to curb the illicit trade in small arms. However, I regret that while dealing with this item, we have listened to the representative of Israel, who attempted to politicize this issue and to enter into matters that are not directly or politically related to the issue. In that context, the representative of Israel seemed to regret the mines planted in South Lebanon. Everyone knows that those mines were planted by Israel — 450,000 mines in southern Lebanon. Israel is the country that planted them, as was recognized by the Secretary-General of the United Nations. We listened to the representative of Israel, who follows the example of a man who kills and then attends his victim's funeral. We regret that the representative of Israel is dealing with political issues that are not directly related to this draft resolution. We wish he had not done that.

The Chairman: As no other delegation wishes to explain its vote or position on the draft resolution just adopted, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.33.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to the conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.33, submitted under agenda item 66, "General and complete disarmament", entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Japan at the 13th meeting, on 16 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are contained in document A/C.1/57/L.33, as well as in document A/C.1/57/INF/2. In addition, the following country has also become a co-sponsor of the draft resolution: Mongolia.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.33 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.33 was adopted.

The Chairman: I now give the floor to the representative of Djibouti, who wishes to explain his delegation's position after the decision has been taken.

Mr. Ali (Djibouti): I believe that Djibouti was a sponsor of this draft resolution, but I do not see our name on the list of sponsors. Therefore, I wish Djibouti's name to be added.

The Chairman: I have taken note of this request.

Is there any other delegation that wishes to explain its position after the decision has been taken? I see none.

The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on those draft resolutions that are contained in cluster 5, namely, regional disarmament and security.

Before doing so, I shall call upon those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote on the draft resolution before the voting.

Does any delegation wish to take the floor? I see none.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.39.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee, who will conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.39, submitted under agenda item 66, general and complete disarmament, entitled "regional disarmament".

This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 14th meeting, on 17 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are contained in document A/C.1/57/L.39, as well as in document A/C.1/57/INF/2. The following country has also become a sponsor of the draft resolution: Saudi Arabia.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.39 was adopted.

The Chairman: I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of position or vote after the decision has been taken.

Does any delegation wish to explain its vote or position? I see none.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.41.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Sattar (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.41, submitted under agenda item 66, general and complete disarmament, entitled "conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 13th meeting, on 16 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are contained in document A/C.1/57/L.41, as well as in document A/C.1/57/INF/2.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolution.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against:

India.

Abstaining:

Bhutan.

Draft resolution A/C.1/57/L.41 was adopted by 149 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote or position on the resolution just adopted.

Mr. Kumar (India): My delegation has taken the floor in order to explain why we could not vote in favour of the draft resolution. There exist, since 1993, guidelines and recommendations for regional approaches to disarmament within the context of global security, which were adopted by the United Nations Disarmament Commission on the basis of consensus. Therefore, we feel that the rationale or the need to consider formulation of principles for a framework for regional arrangements is not persuasive.

India is not convinced of the productive value of calling on the Conference on Disarmament, a forum for negotiation of disarmament of global application, to consider principles for a framework of regional arrangements on conventional arms control. Further, India's security concerns are not confined to what is referred to here as "South Asia".

This being the case, the narrow definition of the resolution does not truly reflect the security concerns in South Asia and adopts an approach that is far too restrictive. Therefore, we could not vote for the resolution.

Mr. Meléndez-Barahona (El Salvador) (*spoke in Spanish*): As in previous years, we would like El Salvador to be included in the list of co-sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.1/57/L.48, L.30 and L.33.

The Chairman: I take note of the statement and request of the representative of El Salvador.

We have completed action on all the resolutions which had been slated for today.

Before adjourning the meeting, I would like to inform members that at it next meeting, the Committee will continue to take action on the draft resolutions as contained in Informal Working Paper No. 3, which has just been distributed.

The draft resolutions that the Committee will consider at its next meeting are as follows: in cluster 6, confidence-building measures, including transparency in armaments, A/C.1/57/L.37, entitled "Transparency in armaments", and A/C.1/57/L.54, entitled "Compliance with arms limitation and disarmament and non-proliferation agreements"; in cluster 7, disarmament machinery, A/C.1/57/L.6, entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission", A/C.1/57/L.13, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament", A/C.1/57/L.29, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa", and A/C.1/57/L.38, entitled "United Nations disarmament fellowship training and advisory services"; and, in cluster 8, other disarmament measures, A/C.1/57/L.1, entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security", A/C.1/57/L.7/Rev.2, entitled "United Nations study on disarmament and non-proliferation education", A/C.1/57/L.12, entitled "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control", A/C.1/57/L.17, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development", A/C.1/57/L.20, entitled "United Nations Disarmament Information Programme", and A/C.1/57/L.50, entitled "Role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament".

The next meeting of the First Committee will be convened tomorrow, 23 October, at 10 a.m. in Conference Room 1.

The meeting rose at 11 a.m.